

“Electroweak symmetry breaking through supersymmetry breaking”

C.A. Savoy

Service de Physique Théorique, CEA-Saclay
 F-91191 Gif-sur-Yvette Cedex, FRANCE

ABSTRACT

The connection between the scales of $SU(2) \times U(1)$ gauge symmetry breaking and supersymmetry breaking is didactically displayed in the framework of a T.O.Y. (Theory Overestimating Yukawas) model, a version of the $(M+1)SSM$ (supersymmetric extension of the standard model with a gauge singlet) in which the relevant parameters are determined in the fixed point regime. Some conspicuous features of supersymmetric particle physics are reviewed in the light of this simplified model. An alternative theory corresponding to $\lim (M+1)SSM \rightarrow MSSM$, leads to interesting inequalities among the supersymmetric breaking parameters of the $MSSM$.

*Invited talk at the 10th Capri Symposium on Particle Physics “Thirty years of elementary particle theory”
 Capri, Italy
 1992*

An instructive way to approach the issues in supersymmetric versions of the standard model^[1,2] is to analyse a simplified theory where the various problems get disentangled enough to be dealt with one after the other. Now let me briefly recall those issues. Supersymmetry has been mostly advocated to solve the so-called hierarchy problem^[3] so it is natural to assume the theory not to be plagued with non-perturbative new physics up to the scale of unification of the fundamental interactions, Λ_{GUT} . The only new scale should be that related to the spontaneous breaking of supersymmetry. Alas we have so far no satisfactory mechanism to generate this breaking and we have to rely on quite general arguments. Supersymmetry violations are then parametrized by the so-called soft terms^[4] in the effective theory^[5] below unification. Within this framework for supersymmetric particle physics, the main features I would like to emphasize are the following.

(i) The parameters of the theory including the soft ones are likely to be related by the symmetries of the grand unified theory.

(ii) The breaking of the electroweak gauge symmetry is presumably a quantum effect that is controlled by supersymmetry breaking and Yukawa couplings^[6,7]. The latter are also quite unknown but a relevant one should be the relatively strong top-Higgs coupling.

(iii) How is the Fermi scale of the $\text{SU}(2) \times \text{U}(1)$ breaking related to that of supersymmetry breaking encoded in the soft terms?

(iv) How massive can the (lightest) Higgs boson be in such theories and can we disprove them if the Higgs is not found at LEP2?

Guided by these questions I consider here an oversimplified version of the theory discussed in Ref.[8]. This T.O.Y. (Theory Overestimating Yukawas) model incorporates most of the features one requires from a realistic model, e.g., the degrees of freedom. But it suffers twice my recourse to poetic licence:

a) gauge couplings are neglected in the RGE evolution of the parameters that are controlled by Yukawas;

b) the unknown couplings are then assumed to be natural at the unification scale.

In order to make assumption b) more precise, we notice that in the absence of gauge couplings the free parameters in the theory are controlled by infrared fixed points, and are ultraviolet divergent. The Yukawa couplings are then considered to be natural if they remain of the same order of magnitude when they become large. The precise relations among these parameters are consequences of the symmetries at the unification scale that are not known. Remarkably enough, this theory possesses an attractive fixed point in the evolution of ratios of parameters^[8]. Whenever the physics is controlled by these fixed ratio points, the unknown grand unification relations among parameters are overwhelmed by new ones obtained from the algebraic coefficients in the RGE. This non-trivial property leads to the reduction of the unknown quantities to two fundamental ones: (the order of magnitude of) the unification scale (Λ_{GUT}), which is suggested by the extrapolation of the gauge couplings, and supersymmetry breaking scale (Λ_{SUSY}) that will be eventually related to that of $\text{SU}(2) \times \text{U}(1)$ breaking (G_F^{-1}). The absence of gauge couplings in the RGE is not a fatal disease as far as they can be turned on and the effects approximated in a simple way^[8] but the T.O.Y. model has a serious drawback that I shall reveal... at

the end.

The model must exhibit $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$ gauge supermultiplets (with gauge boson and gaugino degrees of freedom) and chiral multiplets for the three families of quarks-squarks and leptons-sleptons. I shall concentrate on the heavy quarks of the third family that have the largest Yukawa couplings to Higgs bosons: a $SU(2)$ doublet of coloured chiral superfield (Q) including the left-handed quarks and their squarks and two coloured $SU(2)$ singlet superfields (T, B) holding the right-handed heavy quarks and their squarks. Now it is well-known^[1] that Higgs $SU(2)$ doublets must be inserted in pairs of opposite hypercharge superfields, H_1 with $Y = -1$ and H_2 with $Y = +1$, to cancel the higgsino contributions to the ABJ anomalies.

In supersymmetric theories^[9], the scalar and Yukawa interactions are obviously related and are very tangibly embodied in a superpotential W , invariant under the gauge and global symmetries, such as B and L . Contrarily to naive expectations, there is some room for introducing B or L violations in supersymmetric theories^[10]. This would lead to a rich interesting phenomenology but I skip this issue here in.

Hence the supersymmetric Yukawa couplings of the Higgs to the heavy quarks must correspond to the $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$ invariant superpotential:

$$h_t T Q H_2 + h_b B Q H_1 \quad (1)$$

The two v.e.v.'s $V_1 = \langle H_1 \rangle$ and $V_2 = \langle H_2 \rangle$ provide the scale of $SU(2) \times U(1)$ breaking, $V^2 = V_1^2 + V_2^2 = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} G_F^{-1}$, as well as the quark masses: one known, $m_b = h_b V_1$, the other unknown, $m_t = h_t V_2$. I further assume here below $h_t^2 \gg h_b^2$, $1 < (V_2/V_1) = \tan \beta \lesssim 6$, to remain consistent with the fixed ratio point as discussed later. But the β -angle is actually unknown.

In the minimal supersymmetric version ($MSSM$) of the standard model^[1,7,11–17] the Higgs superfields must be coupled to each other in a supersymmetric mass term of the form $\mu H_1 H_2$. It is not surprising that the analysis of $SU(2) \times U(1)$ breaking^[11–17] requires $\mu \sim O(V)$. Notice, in particular, that this coupling (i.e., $\mu \neq 0$) is necessary^[7] also to prevent a global $U(1)$ symmetry and its spontaneous breaking. Now for the parameter μ to be of $O(V)$ it should be related to the supersymmetry breaking scale Λ_{SUSY} in spite of the supersymmetric nature of the $\mu H_1 H_2$ coupling itself. It has been suggested that light Higgs are pseudo Goldstone bosons that survive the decoupling of the heavy degrees of freedom after the breaking of global and local grand unifying symmetries^[18]. It has also been pointed out that the μ parameter could arise as a relic interaction in the flat limit of broken supergravity^[19]. These ideas have some appeal but here we choose to replace the $MSSM$ mass μ by the supersymmetric Yukawa couplings^[20–24].

$$\lambda S H_1 H_2 + \frac{\kappa}{3} S^3 \quad (2)$$

where S is a gauge singlet supermultiplet. An unwanted $U(1)$ global symmetry is avoided if $\kappa \neq 0$. These couplings together with (1) define a superpotential $W(H_1, H_2, S, T, Q, \dots)$ trilinear in the chiral superfield.

Thus both W and the theory so defined (which I call $(M+1)SSM$ hereafter) have a manifest Z_3 -symmetry which prevents hierarchy problems related to the existence

of light gauge singlets in supersymmetric theories^[25]. Up to now the theory with the superpotential W given by (1) and (2) is supersymmetric and contains no explicit scale.

The spontaneous breaking of supergravity and its scale appear in the effective theory^[5] through the so-called soft terms, of $O(\Lambda_{\text{SUSY}})$, which nicely preserve the special renormalization pattern of supersymmetric theories^[4]. The appropriate ones in our case are the following:

(a) Analytic cubic interactions in the scalar potential

$$A_\lambda \lambda S H_1 H_2 + A_\kappa \frac{\kappa}{3} S^3 + A_t h_t H_i Q T + \dots + \text{h.c.}, \quad (3)$$

where the A -parameters are of $O(\Lambda_{\text{SUSY}})$.

(b) Scalar mass terms

$$m_S^2 |S|^2 + m_1^2 |H_1|^2 + m_2^2 |H_2|^2 + m_T^2 |T|^2 + m_Q^2 |Q|^2 + \dots, \quad (4)$$

with $m_i^2 \sim O(\Lambda_{\text{SUSY}})$ ($i = S_1, H_1, H_2, \dots$).

(c) Mass terms for the $\text{SU}(3) \times \text{SU}(2) \times \text{U}(1)$ gauginos, $M_\alpha (\lambda^\alpha \lambda^\alpha)$, with $M_\alpha \sim O(\Lambda_{\text{SUSY}})$.

So far the theory has many parameters only restricted by the low-energy symmetries, $\text{SU}(3) \times \text{SU}(2) \times \text{U}(1)$, B, L , etc. The missing link in locally supersymmetric theories is indeed the supersymmetry breaking mechanism. At this stage, one can call into play the universality (or flavour independence) of the supergravity couplings and assume a similar property for the soft interactions (3)-(4) in the effective lagrangian with broken local supersymmetry. However, at the quantum level, the scale dependence of the lagrangian given by (1)-(4) has to be taken into account at least through the (flavour dependent) RGE evolution of its couplings. Therefore the universality conditions on the parameters of the soft interactions will be broken by their scale dependence. Hence I assume flavour independence as boundary conditions on the meaning parameters to be matched at the unification scale Λ_{GUT} , not far from the supergravity limit:

$$\begin{aligned} A_a(\Lambda_{\text{GUT}}) &= A_0, \quad (a = t, \lambda, x, \dots) \\ m_i^2(\Lambda_{\text{GUT}}) &= m_0^2, \quad i = S_1, H_1, H_2, T, Q, \dots \\ M_\alpha(\Lambda_{\text{GUT}}) &= M_0, \quad \alpha \in \text{SU}(3) \times \text{SU}(2) \times \text{U}(1) \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Flavour conservation in neutral current interactions (FCNC) supplies some phenomenological support for this universality, at least to some approximation, in the quark-quark sector^[26].

Though the precise choice of Λ_{GUT} would have some quantitative impact on the results here below, I disregard the fact that a few orders of magnitude separate the unification of the gauge couplings from the Planck mass. Then the parameters at the scale (V) of the breaking of the electroweak scale are obtained by solving the RGE for the gauge, Yukawa and soft coupling of the theory^[27,16,21]. On dimensional grounds the resulting soft terms must take the general forms:

$$\begin{aligned} M_\alpha(V) &= \frac{g_\alpha^2(V)}{g_{\alpha 0}^2} M_0 \\ A_a(V) &= a_a A_0 + c_a M_0 \\ m_i^2(V) &= p_i m_0^2 + q_i A_0^2 + \gamma_i M_0^2 + \delta_i (A_0 M_0) \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

The coefficients are functions of the gauge and Yukawa couplings. Since several interactions of each type are mixed up in the RGE, simple solutions might only arise in a fixed point regime. It has been shown in [8] that when gauge couplings are turned off (T.O.Y.) there is one attractive fixed ratio point, i.e., a fixed point in the RGE of ratios of Yukawa couplings. This is a non-trivial property of this particular T.O.Y. model. Its RGE for the Yukawa couplings are as follows^[21] :

$$\begin{pmatrix} \dot{\lambda}^2/\lambda^2 \\ \dot{\kappa}^2/\kappa^2 \\ \dot{h}_t^2/h_t^2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 4 & 1 & 4 \\ 6 & 3 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 8 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \lambda^2 \\ 2\kappa^2 \\ \frac{3}{4}h_t^2 \end{pmatrix} \quad (7)$$

where the dot is for the derivative with respect to the scaling variable $t = (\ln \Lambda/8\pi^2)$ and gauge coupling have been neglected as well as the Yukawa couplings of the Higgs supermultiplet to those associated to the b -quark and other lighter fermions. The ratios $\lambda^2 : \kappa^2 : h_t^2 = 1 : \frac{1}{2} : \frac{4}{3}$ define an attractive fixed point in the scale dependence of the ratios h_t^2/λ^2 and κ^2/λ^2 as given by the one-loop RGE in (7). In order to check that these fixed ratio solutions are not a general property of the running of Yukawa couplings in supersymmetric theories it is enough to enlarge (7) to include the b -quark Higgs coupling, h_b , and verify that there are no fixed ratio solutions anymore unless $h_b = 0$.

This critical point behaviour is equivalent to the requirement that Yukawa couplings remain of the same order of magnitude in the ultraviolet region. Large Yukawa couplings are relevant here as experiments require both the t -quark and the Higgs bosons to be relatively heavy.

Indeed, the obvious question is how heavy the Higgs bosons can be. Well, if one considers the neutral scalar mass matrix for this theory and assumes the right pattern of $SU(2) \times U(1)$ breaking, the mass of the lightest Higgs is bounded as follows^[22] :

$$m_h^2 \leq M_Z^2 \left(\cos^2 2\beta + \frac{\lambda^2}{\bar{g}^2} \sin^2 2\beta \right), \quad (8)$$

where $\bar{g} \simeq .53$ is the gauge coupling of the Z boson. Although the *MSSM* mentioned here in before has a quite different vacuum structure, the corresponding upper bound^[16] on m_h is as in (8) with $\lambda = 0$. This tree-level bound would be seriously affected by the radiative corrections in the presence of relatively large values of Λ_{SUSY} but, still, larger λ 's could cause the lightest Higgs to be heavier.

Now, Yukawa couplings grow logarithmically with the scale unless small enough to be slowed down by the gauge couplings. In a sort it is contradictory to allow for Yukawa getting out of the perturbative domain in a supersymmetric theory. On the contrary, one should rather adopt the approach of Ref.[28] and require all couplings to remain within their perturbative region up to the unification scale, Λ_{GUT} . In this context an upper bound can be put on the λ coupling by taking all the others to be much smaller, which translates into a tree-level upper bound on the mass of the lightest Higgs, to be corrected for quantum effects^[8,29]. It can be further improved by taking into account the experimental lower bound on the top-Higgs coupling^[30].

In view of the relevance of this issue to future experiments, let me make a parenthetical remark on radiative corrections to the bound, (8), on the lightest Higgs mass^[31–35]. The main contributions come from the fields that (i) are more coupled to the Higgs scalars, and (ii) present a large mass splitting between the supersymmetric partners. In other words, the top-stop gives the dominant terms. A rough even though often enough approximation to the radiative shift of the lightest Higgs mass is obtained by stopping the RG running of Higgs mass at an average stop mass and then using the SM running to calculate the top quark effect on the Higgs mass^[32]. This approximation has been also applied to the $(M+1)SSM$ by several authors^[36,37,8,29,30].

An improved estimate of the radiative corrections consists in the evaluation of the one-loop effective potential^[39] and has been performed in the $MSSM$ ^[33] as well as in the framework of the $(M+1)SSM$ ^[39]. Complete one-loop calculations have also been done^[35] to check the previous approximations for the $MSSM$.

All these detailed studies confirm that the radiative shift of the lightest Higgs mass is a conspicuous effect in the presence of large supersymmetry breaking effects. Thus the tree-level upper bound is increased to 140 GeV according to those estimates. However, this fact should not discourage the experimental search for the supersymmetric Higgs at LEP2. The scalar mass matrix depends on various parameters of the supersymmetric models which are constrained by two physical requirements:

- (i) the right pattern of $SU(2) \times U(1)$ breaking;
- (ii) the present experimental bounds on the supersymmetric particles. The spectrum of the $(M+1)SSM$ has been analysed within these constraints^[37] and the lightest Higgs scalar tend to be rather lighter than the upper bound. In other words, LEP2 is really going to exploit the bulk of the expected mass range for (at least) the lightest Higgs.

After this long digression, let me turn back to the specific T.O.Y. model and its “natural” simplifications. So I henceforth assume the fixed ratio regime of the T.O.Y. model. This fixes the Yukawa couplings at scales $\Lambda \ll \Lambda_0$, Λ_0 being defined, e.g., as the scale such that $\lambda^2(\Lambda_0) \sim O(\pi)$:

$$\begin{aligned} h_t^2(\Lambda) &= \frac{4}{3}\lambda^2(\Lambda), \\ \chi^2(\Lambda) &= \frac{1}{2}\lambda^2(\Lambda), \\ \lambda^2 &= \left(\frac{9\ln(\Lambda/\Lambda_0)}{8\pi^2} + \frac{1}{\lambda^2(\Lambda_0)} \right)^{-1} \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

Notice that the theory remain perturbative up to the unification scale if $\Lambda_0 > \Lambda_{\text{GUT}}$. Taking $\Lambda_{\text{GUT}} \sim 10^{16}$ GeV one finds at a scale $\Lambda \sim V = 174$ GeV, $\lambda^2(V) \lesssim \bar{g}^2(V)$ and the tree-level bound $m_h^2 \lesssim M_Z^2$. The corresponding value for h_t is meaningless because this parameter is sensitive to strong gauge interactions that cannot be quite neglected at low energies. An approximation has been introduced in Ref.[8] which shift its value to $h_t(V) \simeq 1$ and gives $m_t \simeq 180(\sin \beta)\text{GeV}$. It is nothing to be surprised about since by choosing values $h_t^2(\Lambda_{\text{GUT}}) > .1$ at the unification scale one always ends with $m_t \gtrsim 120(\sin \beta)\text{GeV}$ in supersymmetric theories. (That explains why m_t is a favourite prediction in recent papers).

Let us now turn our attention to one of the most important issues in supersymmetric particle physics with the help of this simplified model. In order to connect the electroweak scale with Λ_{SUSY} , the soft parameters at low energies ($\Lambda \sim V$) must be expressed like in (6), in terms of A_0 and m_0^2 defined at Λ_{GUT} (in default of gauge couplings in the RGE the coefficients of M_0 vanish). First consider the analytic scalar couplings. The correspondig RGE in the T.O.Y. limit (gauge coupling neglected, fixed ratio regime for Yukawas) turn out to be^[21] :

$$\begin{pmatrix} \dot{A}_\lambda \\ \dot{A}_\kappa \\ \dot{A}_t \end{pmatrix} = \frac{\dot{\lambda}^2}{q} \begin{pmatrix} 4 & 1 & 4 \\ 6 & 3 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 8 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} A_\lambda \\ A_\kappa \\ A_t \end{pmatrix} \quad (10)$$

Interestingly enough the boundary condition $A_a(\Lambda_0) = A_0$ corresponds to an eigenvector of the matrix above leading to the simple solution:

$$\begin{aligned} A_\lambda(\Lambda) &= A_\kappa(\Lambda) = A_t(\Lambda) = \varepsilon(\Lambda) A_0 \\ \varepsilon(\Lambda) &= \frac{\lambda^2(\Lambda)}{\lambda^2(\Lambda_0)} = \frac{1}{1 + \frac{9\lambda^2(\Lambda_0)}{8\pi^2} \ln\left(\frac{\Lambda_0}{\Lambda}\right)} \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

The scalar mass parameters can be arranged in the convenient expressions:

$$\begin{aligned} m_\lambda^2 &= m_S^2 + m_1^2 + m_2^2 - A_\lambda^2 \\ m_\kappa^2 &= 3m_S^2 - A_\kappa^2 \\ m_h^2 &= m_2^2 + m_T^2 + m_Q^2 - A_t^2 \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

In the T.O.Y. approximation the running of the mass parameters is then given by^[21] :

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{pmatrix} \dot{m}_\lambda^2 \\ \dot{m}_\kappa^2 \\ \dot{m}_h^2 \end{pmatrix} &= \dot{\lambda}^2 \begin{pmatrix} 4 & 1 & 4 \\ 6 & 3 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 8 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} m_\lambda^2 \\ m_\kappa^2 \\ m_h^2 \end{pmatrix} \\ \dot{m}_2^2 &= \dot{m}_1^2 + 3\dot{m}_Q^2 \\ \dot{m}_T^2 &= 2\dot{m}_Q^2 \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

Again the boundary conditions ($m_\lambda^2 = m_k^2 = m_h^2 = 3m_0^2 - A_0^2$) define a eigenvector of the matrix in the RGE. Hence the mass parameters at low energies are given by

$$\begin{aligned} m_1^2 &= (2/3 + \varepsilon/3)m_0^2 \\ m_2^2 &= (-2/3 + 5\varepsilon/3)m_0^2 \\ m_S^2 &= \varepsilon m_0^2 \\ m_T^2 &= (1/9 + 8\varepsilon/9)m_0^2 \\ m_Q^2 &= (5/9 + 4\varepsilon/9)m_0^2 \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

with ε given in (11).

As announced, the T.O.Y. hypotheses have led to a simple one-loop pattern whose main characteristics are:

(i) At low energies all the parameters are written in terms of the high scale Λ_0 , where $\lambda^2(\Lambda_0) \gg 1$, and of m_0^2 and A_0 that measure Λ_{SUSY} . Consistency with my assumptions requires $\Lambda_0 \simeq \Lambda_{\text{GUT}}$.

(ii) The A -parameters, assumed to be all equal at Λ_{GUT} remain equal and decrease as $(\ln \Lambda/\Lambda^0)^{-1}$ at lower energies.

(iii) The $Y = -1$ Higgs field gets a negative (mass)², $m_1^2 \longrightarrow -(2m_0^2/3)$, which draws $\text{SU}(2) \times \text{U}(1)$ breaking.

The soft terms are instrumental in breaking the electroweak gauge symmetry. Models with $\text{SU}(2) \times \text{U}(1)$ breaking induced by the supersymmetric part of the scalar potential suffer from hierarchy problems^[25]. On the contrary, soft cubic interactions and negative scalar mass terms are safe of these problems. The real task is to check whether the resulting symmetry breaking pattern is phenomenologically correct. Some of the questions to be investigated are the following:

(a) Coloured and/or charged scalar quark and leptons must have zero v.e.v.'s, an obstacle that I shall eventually meet with and discuss here below.

(b) In models with more than one Higgs doublet, their v.e.v.'s have to align in such a way to preserve the electromagnetic gauge invariance. This is a non-trivial property of supersymmetric theories with only Higgs doublets^[40]. The problem remains instead an open one in the presence of singlet fields although a sufficient condition to prevent $\text{U}(1)_{\text{e.m.}}$ breaking is $\lambda^2 < g_2^2$, where g_2 is the W -boson coupling constant^[41].

(c) It is well-known that models with a richer Higgs sector have been considered to produce spontaneous CP violation^[42]. An elegant proof has been given^[43] that softly broken supersymmetry models conserve CP. The proof in Ref.[43] assumes that $\text{U}(1)_{\text{e.m.}}$ is not broken but it can be easily generalized. Thus the v.e.v.'s can be taken to be real.

I postpone the discussion of (a) and skip the check that charged Higgs v.e.v.'s are zero in the T.O.Y. model with the parameters as calculated. The scalar potential for the real (CP-even) parts of the neutral scalar field reads:

$$\begin{aligned} V = & \frac{\lambda^2}{2} [Y^4 + 2Y^2V_1^2 + 2Y^2V_2^2 + 2V_1^2V_2^2 - 2\sqrt{2}Y^2V_1V_2] \\ & + \frac{\bar{g}^2}{4} (V_1^2 - V_2^2)^2 - A_0\varepsilon\lambda \left(2YV_1V_2 + \frac{\sqrt{2}}{3}Y^3 \right) \\ & + \varepsilon m_0^2 (Y^2 + V_1^2 + V_2^2) + \frac{2}{3}(1 - \varepsilon)m_0^2 (V_1^2 - V_2^2) \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

where $V_i = \langle \text{Re } H_i^0 \rangle$ ($i = 1, 2$) and $Y = \langle \text{Re } S \rangle$. First consider the case $\varepsilon \ll 1$.

Then, the minimization of the potential gives:

$$\begin{aligned} V_1 &= Y = 0 \\ V_2^2 &= \frac{4m_0^2}{3\bar{g}^2}, \quad m_0^2 = \frac{3}{4}M_Z^2 \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

Namely, a very simple relation between the supersymmetry breaking parameter m_0^2 and M_Z^2 results under the T.O.Y. hypotheses. Since $\lambda^2 \simeq \bar{g}^2$, all neutral scalars get a mass $\simeq M_Z$ (M_W for the charged scalar).

However these results are inconsistent with phenomenology because leptons and $Q = -1/3$ quarks remain massless as far as $V_1 = 0$. Some higgsinos remain massless as well. There is no way to improve this situation by taking into account gauge interactions without invalidating our approximations (e.g. by assuming very large

gaugino masses). Before I discard this solution it is worth stressing that, in spite of the relatively involved RGE and the presence of many Yukawas, the existence of a fixed point reduces the relation between $SU(2) \times U(1)$ and supersymmetry breaking scales to the specific one in (16).

Since ε is not so small in practice, one may seek solutions such that $A_0 \sim O(V/\varepsilon)$, implying $\Lambda_{\text{SUSY}} \gg V$. The minimization is now a bit more complicated but there are indeed solutions with all neutral scalars taking a v.e.v. for particular choices of A_0 and m_0^2 . It is convenient to express these solutions by the relations:

$$\begin{aligned} m_0^2 &= \frac{3}{4} (1 + 2\rho^2) (-\cos 2\beta) M_Z^2 \\ \varepsilon A_0 &= 2\rho \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}\rho^2 + \sin 2\beta} \right) M_Z \\ \rho^4 (2\sin 2\beta - 1) - 2 (\cos^2 2\beta) \rho^2 + \sin^2 2\beta &= 0 \\ \rho &= \frac{Y}{V}, \quad \tan \beta = \frac{V_2}{V_1}, \\ V &= \sqrt{V_1^2 + V_2^2} \quad M_Z = \bar{g}V \simeq \lambda V \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

Numerically they are as follows:

- (a) solutions interpolating between $\{\tan \beta = 1, \varepsilon A_0 \simeq 2\sqrt{2}M_Z, m_0^2 \simeq 0\}$ and $\{\tan \beta = 10, \varepsilon A_0 \simeq \sqrt{2}M_Z, m_0^2 \simeq M_Z^2/2\}$;
- (b) solutions interpolating between $\{\tan \beta = -1, \varepsilon A_0 \simeq -1.5M_Z, m_0^2 \simeq 0\}$ and $\{\tan \beta = -10, \varepsilon A_0 \simeq -1.3M_Z, m_0^2 \simeq M_Z^2/2\}$;
- (c) $\tan \beta \simeq 1, \varepsilon A_0 \simeq 4M_Z$ and m_0^2 between 0 and M_Z^2 .

In other words, there are solutions with large supersymmetry breaking, $M_Z/\varepsilon < A_0 < 2M_Z/\varepsilon$ but they are characterized by relatively small values of $m_0^2 \sim O(M_Z^2)$. By including gauge couplings in the RGE and gaugino masses M_0 the T.O.Y. model could be turned into a realistic one. (As shown in Ref.[21], gaugino masses can also be generated by the decoupling of heavy multiplets of grand unified theories in the presence of a large A_0).

However, it is well-known that models of this kind are phenomenologically excluded^[44,21]. Indeed, if the supermultiplets holding the light fermions are taken into account with the corresponding soft terms fulfilling the universal boundary conditions (5), there is an (approximate) condition to be satisfied by the parameters A_0 and m_0^2 . Let me formulate it by considering the inclusion of the electron supersymmetrized degrees of freedom, in particular the scalars E , with $Y = 1, T = 0$ and L , with $Y = -1/2, T = 1/2$. The Yukawa coupling $h_e = m_e/v_2 \ll g_2$ is very small. It has been shown^[21] that the scalars E, L and H_1 will develop a v.e.v. at low energies unless

$$A_e^2 < 3(m_1^2 + m_E^2 + m_L^2) \tag{18}$$

at scales of $O(A_0/\lambda_e)$. Notice that (18) has been proved only if the parameters m_1^2, m_E^2 and m_L^2 are not very different (contrarily to what is stated in Ref.[45], that produces counterexamples by violating this assumption clearly written in Ref.[21]). Therefore, models that violate (18) present an absolute minimum that breaks $U(1)_{\text{e.m.}}$ and L and are to be discarded. In the framework of the T.O.Y. model these parameters at low energy turn out to be $A_e \simeq 8A_0/9, m_1^2 + m_E^2 + m_L^2 \simeq 8m_0^2/3$. Hence, the class of

solutions with large supersymmetric breaking violate (18) since $A_0^2 > (m_0^2/\varepsilon^2)$. The inclusion of gaugino masses cannot implement the right symmetry breaking pattern.

Notice that under similar assumptions, (18) also excludes models with $SU(2) \times U(1)$ symmetry breaking occurring already at the tree-level. This would require^[1] $A_\lambda^2 > 3(m_1^2 + m_2^2 + m_S^2)$ and universality of the soft terms would prevent (18). Thus, radiative symmetry breaking is generally called for in model building.

Summing up, the simplifications introduced by the assumptions of the T.O.Y. model allow for simple one-loop expressions for the various parameters. Gauge symmetry breaking is induced because the (mass)² of one of the Higgs scalars become negative at low energies under the effect of large Yukawa couplings in its evolution, in particular that of the top coupling. In the T.O.Y. model approximation Λ_{SUSY} can be analytically related to V . There is a minimum of the scalar potential with $M_Z^2 = 4m_0^2/3$. In order to induce v.e.v.'s for both Higgs field one has to adjust otherwise the parameters. In general, the relations will be loosened after the relaxation of the hypotheses of the T.O.Y. model. But the existence of a phenomenologically satisfactory vacuum is a strong constraint on the parameters, including the scale of supersymmetry breaking.

A thorough analysis of the $(M+1)SSM$ is in progress^[46] which takes into account present experimental limits on supersymmetric particles. The solutions tend to favour large v.e.v.'s for the singlet S . One finds $\langle S \rangle = Y \gtrsim 8M_Z$, and relatively large values of the Yukawa couplings κ and λ are suppressed. In a sense one is naturally led to consider the following limit of the $(M+1)SSM$:

$$(Y/V) \longrightarrow \infty \quad \kappa, \lambda \longrightarrow 0 \quad (19)$$

$\mu = \lambda Y$, $\nu = \kappa Y$ fixed.

It is easily checked^[24,46] that in this limit the singlet fields decouple, and the $MSSM$ is approached. The singlet fermion, with mass 2ν , and the singlet scalars, with masses $3A_\kappa\nu$ and $(2\nu^2 - m_S^2)$ have couplings of $O(V/Y)$ to the $MSSM$ sector. The usual soft supersymmetry breaking terms in the $MSSM$ are then related to those in this limit of the $(M+1)SSM$ as follows:

$$\mu = \lambda Y \quad B = (A_\lambda - \nu) \quad (20)$$

as can be also seen from two of the potential minimization conditions in the limit of Eq.(19):

$$\begin{aligned} (m_1^2 + m_2^2 + 2\mu^2) \sin 2\beta &= (A_\kappa - \nu) \mu \\ (M_Z^2 - m_1^2 - m_2^2 - 2\mu^2) \cos 2\beta &= m_2^2 - m_1^2 \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

The minimization of the potential with respect to the singlet field requires:

$$\nu = \frac{A_\kappa}{4} \left(1 + \sqrt{1 - \frac{8m_S^2}{A_\kappa^2}} \right) \quad (22)$$

and implies the following condition on the soft term parameters:

$$A_\kappa^2 > 8m_S^2 \quad (23)$$

It becomes specially interesting if the universality conditions (5) are required at the level of the $(M+1)SSM$. Since κ and λ are small, I can use the analytic approximate solutions of Ref.[17] to write the low energy soft interactions in terms of the universal parameters A_0 , m_0^2 and M_0 , as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} A_h &= A_0 (1 - .78h^2) + M_0 (3.96 - 1.72h^2) \\ A_\lambda &= A_0 (1 - .39h^2) + M_0 (.59 - .86h^2) \\ A_\kappa &\simeq A_0 \\ m_{H_1}^2 &= m_0^2 + .52M_0^2 \\ m_{H_2}^2 &= m_{H_1}^2 - h^2 [1.16m_0^2 + (.384 - .30h^2) A_0^2 \\ &\quad + (1.72 - 1.33h^2) M_0 A_0 + (4.93 - 1.48h^2) M_0^2] \\ m_S^2 &= m_0^2 \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

where h^2 is the top-Higgs Yukawa coupling at low energies. (Analogous expressions are obtained for the other soft terms). Then, the inequalities (18) and (25) can be translated into the following inequalities^[46] for A_0 , M_0 , m_0^2 :

$$\sqrt{8}m_0 < |A_0| < .69M_0 + \sqrt{3.25M_0^2 + 9m_0^2} \quad (25)$$

On the top of (25) one has to fulfill (21) to avoid a $SU(2) \times U(1)$ conserving solution. Two remarks are in order here:

(a) This relation follows from the minimization with respect to the singlet field, which has no equivalent in the $MSSM$

(b) It is only an approximation as far as corrections $O(V/Y)$ are taken into account. In general^[46] the solutions of the $(M+1)SSM$ can depart quite a lot from this asymptotic pattern.

It is worth noticing that even near the $MSSM$ the $(M+1)SSM$ has additional degrees of freedom that mix at $O(V/Y)$ to the neutralino and neutral Higgs sector and might be observable. In the limiting cases (21)-(24) yield $\nu \simeq A_0/4$ so that a $CP = +1$ state could be relatively light.

Recent experimental data have provided useful lower bounds on the parameters of supersymmetric models. Only lately the experiments reached an energy scale that can be considered as natural in supersymmetric theories. In view of that most of the theoretical analyses performed a few years ago must be revisited. This has been done to a large extent in the framework of the $MSSM$ and has proved useful in the analysis of LEP data. A similar effort is now under way in the case of the $(M+1)SSM$.

At the First Capri Symposium, in 1983, I reviewed supersymmetric particle physics^[2] and concluded that in spite of the striking effects that are expected the natural mass spectrum seemed to be such that no significant experimental result should be expected before LEP. (I underestimated slightly the ability of hadron colliders to measure gluino masses). LEP1 is already an old story. But the great excitement is still to come with the next generation of experiments, (LEP2, LHC), supposed to test the mostly natural region of masses of supersymmetric particles.

REFERENCES

- [1] For a review see, for example, H. Nilles, Phys. Rep. C **110** (1984) 1.
- [2] C.A. Savoy, Lectures at the 1st Capri Symposium and at the 18th Rencontre de Moriond, in *Beyond the Standard Model*; J.T.T. Van, ed., (Editions Frontières, Gif, 1983).
- [3] L. Maiani in Proc. Gif Summer School, 1979 (IN2P3, Paris, 1980).
M. Veltman, Acta Phys. Pol. B **12** (1981) 437.
E. Witten, Nucl. Phys. B **188** (1981) 513.
- [4] L. Girardello and M.T. Grisaru, Nucl. Phys. B **194** (1982) 65.
- [5] R. Barbieri, S. Ferrara and C.A. Savoy, Phys. Lett. **119B** (1982) 343.
L. Hall, J. Likken and S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. D **27** (1983) 2359.
- [6] L. Ibanez and G.G. Ross, Phys. Lett. **110B** (1982) 215.
- [7] L. Alvarez-Gaume, J. Polshinsky and M. Wise, Nucl. Phys. B **221** (1983) 495.
- [8] P. Binétruy and C.A. Savoy, Phys. Lett. B **277** (1992) 453.
- [9] For a review see, e.g., P. Fayet and S. Ferrara, Phys. Rep. **32C** (1977) 250.
- [10] S. Dimopoulos and L. Hall, Phys. Lett. B **207** (1988) 210 and references therein.
- [11] L.E. Ibanez and C. Lopez, Nucl. Phys. B **233** (1984) 511.
- [12] J. Ellis, J.S. Hagelin, D.V. Nanopoulos and K. Tamvakis, Phys. Lett. **125B** (1983) 275.
E. Cremmer, P. Fayet, L. Girardello, Phys. Lett. **122B** (1983) 346.
- [13] M. Claudson, L. Hall and I. Hinchliffe, Nucl. Phys. B **228** (1983) 501.
- [14] C. Kounnas, A.B. Lahanas, D.V. Nanopoulos and M. Quiros, Nucl. Phys. B **236** (1984) 438.
- [15] A. Bouquet, J. Kaplan and C.A. Savoy, Phys. Lett. **148B** (1984) 69.
- [16] K. Inoue, A. Kakuto, H. Komatsu and S. Takeshita, Prog. Theo. Phys. **67** (1982) 1859; **68** (1982) 927.
- [17] A. Bouquet, J. Kaplan and C.A. Savoy, Nucl. Phys. B **262** (1985) 299.
- [18] K. Inoue, A. Kakuto and T. Takano, Prog. Theo. Phys. **75** (1986) 664.
A.A. Ansel'm and A.A. Johansen, Phys. Lett. B **200** (1988) 331.
- [19] G.F. Giudice and A. Masiero, Phys. Lett. B **206** (1988) 480.
- [20] H.P. Nilles, M. Srednicki and D. Wyler, Phys. Lett. **120B** (1983) 346.
- [21] J.P. Derendinger and C.A. Savoy, Nucl. Phys. B **237** (1984) 307.
- [22] M. Drees, Intern. J. Mod. Phys. A **4** (1989) 3635.
- [23] L. Durand and J. Lopez, Phys. Lett. B **217** (1989) 463.
- [24] J. Ellis, H. Haber, J.F. Gunion, L. Roszkowski and F. Zwirner, Phys. Rev. D **39** (1989) 844.
- [25] H.P. Nilles, M. Srednicki and D. Wyler, Phys. Lett. B **124** (1983) 337.
A. Lahanas, Phys. Lett. B **124** (1983) 341.
- [26] S. Dimopoulos and H. Georgi, Nucl. Phys. B **193** (1981) 150.
J. Ellis and D.V. Nanopoulos, Phys. Lett. B **110** (1982) 44.

- R. Barbieri and R. Gatto, Phys. Lett. B **110** (1982) 211.
- [27] R. Barbieri, S. Ferrara, L. Maiani, F. Palumbo and C.A. Savoy, Phys. Lett. B **115** (1982) 212.
- M. Einhorn and D.R.T. Jones, Nucl. Phys. B **196** (1982) 475.
- [28] N. Cabibbo, L. Maiani, G. Parisi and R. Petronzio, Nucl. Phys. B **158** (1979) 295.
- [29] J. Espinoza and M. Quiros, Phys. Lett. B **279** (1992) 92.
- [30] J. Espinoza and M. Quiros, Instituto de Estructura de la Materia preprint IEM-FT-60/92.
- U. Ellwanger and M. Lindner, Heidelberg preprint HD-THEP-92-48rev.
- T. Elliot, S.F. King and P.L. White, Southampton preprint SHEP 92/93-11.
- [31] Y. Ohada, M. Yamaguchi and T. Yanagida, Prog. Theo. Phys. Lett. **85** (1991) 1.
- H. Haber and R. Hempfling, Phys. Rev. Lett. **66** (1991) 1815.
- J. Ellis, G. Ridolfi and F. Zwirner, Phys. Lett. B **257** (1991) 83.
- [32] R. Barbieri, M. Frigeni and F. Caravaglios, Phys. Lett. B **258** (1991) 167.
- [33] J. Ellis, R. Ridolfi and F. Zwirner, Phys. Lett. B **262** (1991) 477.
- [34] A. Yamada, Phys. Lett. B **263** (1991) 233.
- [35] P. Chankowski, S. Pokorski and J. Rosiek, Phys. Lett. B **274** (1992) 191.
- A. Brignole, Phys. Lett. B **281** (1992) 284.
- [36] J. Espinoza and M. Quiros, Phys. Lett. B **266** (1991) 389.
- [37] U. Ellwanger and M. Rausch de Traubenberg, Z. Phys. C **53** (1992) 521.
- [38] S. Coleman and E. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. D **7** (1973) 1888.
- S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. D **7** (1973) 2887.
- [39] U. Ellwanger, Heidelberg preprint HD-THEP-93-4.
- [40] D. Chang and A. Kumar, Phys. Rev. D **31** (1985) 2698.
- [41] M. Olechowski and S. Pokorski, Phys. Lett. B **214** (1988) 393.
- [42] G.C. Branco, Phys. Rev. D **22** (1980) 201.
- [43] J.C. Romao, Phys. Lett. B **173** (1986) 309.
- [44] J.M. Frère, D.R.T. Jones and S. Raby, Nucl. Phys. B **222** (1983) 11.
- [45] J.F. Gunion, H.E. Haber and M. Sher, Nucl. Phys. B **306** (1988) 1.
- [46] U. Ellwanger et al., in preparation